

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

EDWARD HANKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANTHONY A. RAMOS, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 3:06-cv-195-DGW

ORDER

Currently pending before the Court are Plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. 26) and Defendant Walker's motion for an extension of time to respond to Plaintiff's second set of interrogatories. (Doc. 39).

MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY

Plaintiff avers in this motion, placed in the institutional mail on March 4, 2008, that Defendants failed to respond to his first set of interrogatories despite the Court's order that they do so by March 4, 2008. Plaintiff requests that the Defendants be sanctioned and that he be paid \$500.00 for the failure to respond.

In response (Doc. 29), Defendants aver that they mailed their responses to Plaintiff on March 3, 2008. Defendants attach as an exhibit a letter from Plaintiff dated March 12, 2008, acknowledging receipt of the responses (Doc. 30).

Based on this timeline, the Court finds that Plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. 26) is without merit, and is therefore **DENIED**.

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TOE PLAINTIFF'S SECOND
INTERROGATORIES**

Defendant Roger E. Walker seeks additional time to respond to Plaintiff's second interrogatories (Doc. 39). This motion is **GRANTED**. Defendant Walker shall respond to Plaintiff's second set of interrogatories on or before May 16, 2008. Because the date for the close of discovery and deadline for filing dispositive motions are approaching, the Court informs the parties that it does not intend to grant any further requests for extensions of time for discovery.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 5, 2008

s/ Donald G. Wilkerson
DONALD G. WILKERSON
United States Magistrate Judge